

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#243: Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife**

US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review**

**Bay Regional Review**

**Delta Regional Review**

**San Joaquin Regional Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**External Scientific Review**

#1

#2

#3

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

**Proposal Number:** 243

**Applicant Organization:** US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station

**Proposal Title:** Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

#### Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

**Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan** (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

**Not Recommended** (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

#### Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	-
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	X

Amount:    **\$0**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

**None.**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**The selection panel was most supportive of the proposal to inventory and study habitat relationships for giant garter snake. The lack of detail provided and high costs of that work, however, leaves this proposal not appropriate for funding at this time. If the proposal were to be revised in the future, the panel encourages a more detailed articulation of task one activities as a stand alone project.**

## Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

**Proposal Number:** 243

**Applicant Organization:** US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station

**Proposal Title:** Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife

**Review:**

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Superior:** outstanding in all respects;

**Above Average:** Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Adequate:** No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Not Recommended:** Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	<b>Two of the outside scientific reviewers rated the proposal good, and one excellent. The former two reviewers both were concerned about budget being too high. One commented that the car expenses were out of bounds. One scientific reviewer and one regional review (Sacramento) had widely varying assessments of priority of the component studies. The scientific reviewers suggest dropping Objective 4, which Sacramento Valley Region agrees is of low priority. We suggest that CALFED explore ways to trim the budget of this proposal, including severely cutting the exorbitant vehicle rental fees and by dropping Objective 4. Furthermore, prior to funding, experimental protocols and performance measures need to be much more clearly spelled out and approved by CALFED scientists or panel members.</b>
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

**Goals are clear. The project is well justified given the need to understand biology of the species addressed. One reviewer questioned rolling three projects in one with little thematic unification; that reviewer also raised issues on sampling problems (see below).**

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

**The team is well qualified. One reviewer raised methodological questions and performance measures appear weak.**

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

**The proposed project would provide key information about species of concern. Task 4 may be a very good research project, but the usefulness to decision-makers seems limited.**

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**Experiment looks very costly overall. There are concerns about some of the budgetary items, notably the vehicle rentals, and Task 4 (related to Pacific white-fronted goose) should be discarded.**

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

**Bay: Ranking low. Study proposal more applicable to restoration actions in the Sacramento River and Delta regions.**

**Delta: Ranking medium. This research could provide information that will improve our understanding of how the target species use the Delta. It is helpful, but not essential.**

**San Joaquin: The panel believed there were proposals with more direct benefit to the SJ Valley. This proposal is Delta and Sac Valley related. Should be referred to those teams.**

**Sacramento: The panel could not determine a single priority for the entire project. They decided to give a priority of HIGH to component 1 because it is a critical need for the species, and is part of an ongoing conservation effort. Component 3 was a MEDIUM priority for the region because of the lack of information on the species. Components 2 and 4 were LOW because they seemed less feasible and less relevant to ongoing restoration efforts. Seems more of a Fish and Wildlife function and that their charter calls for them to perform this work already and that it should not be CALFED funded**

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

**Budget: Verify applicant's overhead attributed to non-salary costs. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified? No: PM is not a segregated cost, but rather built into salary rate for USGS biologists.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## **Bay Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 243

**Applicant Organization:** US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station

**Proposal Title:** Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife

Overall Ranking:    **X**Low    -Medium    -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**Study proposal more applicable to restoration actions in the Sacramento River and Delta regions.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Applies demonstrated techniques to assessing wildlife response to restoration and changed management. Investigators well qualified.**

**Proposal builds on existing CalFed funded research and other research projects.**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Research project provides a regional context for evaluating the effects of restoration on wetland dependent wildlife.**

**MR 2 Develop programs for Wildlife Friendly Farming, conduct studies.**

**Specifically identifies need for investigations into Giant garter snake in Attachement III of ERP draft Stage I Imp Plan**

**Goal 1 objective 2 and 3 species at risk**

**Goal 3, objective 3 waterfowl harvestable species Attachement II CalFed Program.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Results of study will provide a mechanism for determining sensitivity of wetland dependent wildlife to restoration and changes in management. Understand changes in distribution in response to hab. change. Determine how projected changes will affect subject wildlife.**

**The proposal builds on existing CalFed and CVPIA research and other multidisciplinary projects assessing species response to habitat change, primarily giant garter snake.**

**Results will be a useful tool in determining sensitivity of wildlife including species at risk to habitat change. Useful to CVJV, DU, FWS, DFG, and others in guiding and informing restoration, recovery and management**

**The proposed research is coordinated with other research and investigators.**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

-Yes XNo

How?

**Results will be presented in peer reviewed articles and at scientific meetings and in reports to CalFed.**

Other Comments:

**The proposal more applicable to Sacramento River/Delta Priorities.**

## Delta Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 243

**Proposal Title:** Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife

Overall Ranking:   -Low   **XMedium**   -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**This research could provide information that will improve our understanding of how the target species use the Delta. It is helpful, but not essential.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**most of the area identified is public land but other parts of the Delta may be a problem to get access to sample for ginat garter snake (GGS).**

**researchers have great experiences with the landowners, however**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**research to improve protection of at-risk species ((MR 6)**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**research on migratory birds and GGS**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

**X**Yes -No

How?



**clear committment to obtain access from private land owners**

Other Comments:

**could provide some very important data that could greatly improve our understanding of GGS distribution in the Delta and migratory bird use of the Delta**

## San Joaquin Regional Review:

**Proposal Number:** 243

**Applicant Organization:** US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station

**Proposal Title:** Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife

Overall Ranking:    -Low    **XMedium**    -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**The panel believed there were proposals with more direct benefit to the SJ Valley. This proposal is Delta and Sac Valley related. Should be referred to those teams.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Experienced staff. Much of this is a continuation and/or expansion of current work. Feasible with proper funding. Already doing or have done similar work.**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

-Yes **X**No

How?

**Mostly Delta and Sacramento Valley related. Little direct utility or benefit to SJ Valley.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**To the degree needed. Results will be especially useful to CALFED restoration projects in the future.**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Local access appears to be good. Many local relationships and tie-ins.**

Other Comments:

**This should be reviewed by Delta and Sacramento Valley teams.**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 243

**Applicant Organization:** US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station

**Proposal Title:** Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife

Overall Ranking:    -Low    -Medium    **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**The panel could not determine a single priority for the entire project. They decided to give a priority of HIGH to component 1 because it is a critical need for the species, and is part of an ongoing conservation effort. The panel felt component 3 was a MEDIUM priority for the region because of the lack of information on the species. Components 2 and 4 were given a priority of LOW because they seemed less feasible and less relevant to ongoing restoration efforts.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**This is a qualified Yes. The proposal consists of four components: 1) survey for and identify habitat requirements of giant garter snakes in the Delta, 2) identify distribution of waterfowl species throughout the Central Valley of California to identify effects of CALFED actions, 3) determine habitat use and migration patterns of sandhill cranes, and 4) monitor habitat use and determine effects of land use change on greater white fronted geese. The first and third components of this study, determining giant garter snake and sandhill crane distribution and habitat requirements within the Delta region are quite feasible given local constraints. The second and fourth components, evaluating the distribution of waterfowl species throughout the Central Valley and evaluating the effects of land use changes on greater white fronted geese may not be feasible in the given time frame and with the data available. These components of the study might be refined and reduced in scope.**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The project addresses several restoration priorities for the multi-region area, including priority 2, to conduct studies to better understand the relationships between farming and wildlife habitat, and priority 6, to ensure recovery of at-risk species.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

-Yes XNo

How?

**Component 1 of the project is well linked with the USFWS Draft Recovery Plan for Giant Garter Snakes and other ongoing efforts to conserve this species, including projects within National Wildlife Refuges, the Natomas Basin, and on private mitigation areas, but the waterfowl monitoring components of the study do not appear to be well linked with other ongoing waterfowl monitoring efforts, such as efforts being conducted by the Central Valley Joint Venture , California Waterfowl Association, or Ducks Unlimited.**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

-Yes XNo

How?

**Once again, the giant garter snake component has identified the Natomas Basin Conservancy as a cost share partner, and has obtained permission to access private and public land. For the other components of the study, the proposal does not describe coordination with other organizations conducting CALFED restoration programs, or with other local or state migratory bird conservation organizations. The panel felt the study would benefit from greater local involvement, including briefings and workshops.**

Other Comments:

**The giant garter snake study in the Delta is a critical need for this at-risk species. An evaluation of the current distribution of the sandhill crane would also be highly relevant to CALFED restoration efforts for this species. However, the larger-scale waterfowl and greater white fronted goose studies may be too large in scope and scale to produce meaningful results, and may not adequately incorporate existing information and conservation efforts. The panel wondered if the effects of CALFED restoration projects would be possible to detect at this point in time.**

## External Scientific: #1

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **243**

Applicant Organization: **US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station**

Proposal Title: **Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

**X**Correct

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

**none**

#### Review:

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Excellent: outstanding in all respects;**

**Good: quality but some deficiencies;**

**Poor: serious deficiencies.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
<b>X</b> Excellent	<b>Very strong proposal in all respects.</b>
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

**Yes. Yes.**

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

**Yes. Yes. Research: justified.**

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to

decision-makers?

**Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.**

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

**Yes. P>90%. Yes.**

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

**Yes. Yes. Yes.**

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

**Yes. Yes. Yes.**

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

**Excellent. Yes. Yes.**

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**Yes.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## External Scientific: #2

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **243**

Applicant Organization: **US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station**

Proposal Title: **Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

**X**Correct

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

**none**

#### Review:

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Excellent: outstanding in all respects;**

**Good: quality but some deficiencies;**

**Poor: serious deficiencies.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	<b>Overall the proposed project has well defined goals that are consistent with CALFED ERP. The knowledge gained, in particular, related to the giant garter snake and sandhill crane, will be extremely valuable in the future management of these species. The project itself is an excellent project. However, the cost appears to be high. Some areas of the budget could be trimmed down to make the project more cost efficient.</b>
<b>X</b> Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

**I believe the goals are clearly stated with the exception of the general waterfowl, task 2. Goals and objectives are consistent throughout the proposal.**

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?



**The project is justified given the lack of knowledge related to giant garter snake and sandhill cranes. Greater knowledge is necessary to effectively manage these species in the future. Also the decreasing use of the delta by waterfowl gives justification to the waterfowl portion of the study.**

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

**The approach should produce useful information related to decision making, given that the field crews are able to collect adequate data. Radio and satellite telemetry are proven techniques that provide useful results.**

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

**Technically the approach is feasible, however uncontrollable circumstances (weather, lack of study animals) could provide difficulty. The study techniques have all been proven to work in other studies.**

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

**Yes, the project includes progress reports. However it does not provide detail as to how the performance will be quantified.**

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

**This project should produce valuable insight for future management of the studied species. This insight should be beneficial to CalFed related habitat restoration projects.**

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

**The applicant has a good track record for this type of research project. The research team is qualified and capable of completing the proposed project.**

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**From a personnel perspective the budget is high but reasonable. Equipment costs also appear to be high. The car rental costs is in excess of 250,000 for a three year study. It is important to budget for the unexpected costs that always seem to appear, but this may be excessive.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## External Scientific: #3

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **243**

Applicant Organization: **US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station**

Proposal Title: **Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

**X**Correct

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

**none**

#### Review:

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Excellent: outstanding in all respects;**

**Good: quality but some deficiencies;**

**Poor: serious deficiencies.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	<b>This project consists of 4 mostly unrelated research projects. Two of them are excellent (Tasks 1 and 3) , one of them is good (Task 2), and the last one seems to be overkill.</b>
XGood	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

**The objectives are stated, but hypotheses are missing. This project really consists of four projects (identified as tasks in the proposal) and I saw no justification for combining them into one project. Tasks 1 and 4 study two species (giant Garter Snake and Sand Hill Crane) for which basic information is needed to develop a management plan. This is timely and important. The other two tasks try to estimate the effect of CALFED implementation on waterfowl in general and Pacific White-fronted Goose in particular. The problems associated with before-after sampling and temporal variation due to climate etc. are not addressed.**

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

**Clear justification for each task is provided and all should be classified as research (which they are).**

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

**Task 1 and 3 are well designed and will provide information useful to decision-makers. Task 2 needs to be improved to incorporate the problems associated with before-after sampling (see for example Underwood, A. J. 1992. Australian Journal of Marine and Freshwater Restoration 42:569-587). Task 4 maybe a very good research project, but the usefulness to decision-makers seems limited.**

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

**The approach is sufficiently documented and technically feasible. The likelihood of success is highest for task 1 and 3. For research projects there is always some success. The scale of the project is consistent with the objectives, with exception of Task 4 (too big).**

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

**No appropriate performance measures were provided.**

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

**This is a research project and as such will increase the knowledge on several species of wildlife.**

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

**The project team is qualified.**

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**4.3 million dollars seems extremely high. I especially question the vehicle rentals \$94,000 in year 1, \$105,000 in year 2, and \$14,400 in year 3. Is it not cheaper to buy a vehicle?**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 243

**Applicant Organization:** US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station

**Proposal Title:** Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

**Budget:****Proposal Number:** 243**Applicant Organization:** US Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, WERC, Dixon Field Station**Proposal Title:** Assessment of CALFED Priority Wetland-Dependent Wildlife

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

**Verify applicant's OH attributed to non-salary costs.**

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**PM is not a segregated cost, but rather built into salary rate for USGS biologists.**

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: